

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/694,860	10/29/2003	Kenneth A. Thomas	84820-4402 ADB	84820-4402 ADB 5712	
530 73	530 7590 03/13/2006		EXAMINER		
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,			JOLLEY, KIRSTEN		
KRUMHOLZ &	& MENTLIK				
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1762	1762	

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/694,860	THOMAS, KENNE	TH A.		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Kirsten C. Jolley	1762			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	dress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Property is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Jac</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		merits is		
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-23 is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-8,10 and 11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	n from consideration.				
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFI	` '		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	,				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔲 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	152)		

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miekka et al. (US 6,540,865) in view of Xie et al. (US 6,503,620) alone, or further in view of Piacente et al. (US 5,178,912).

Miekka et al. discloses a method for forming a tape comprising: providing a base material having a first surface and a second surface; applying a first layer of a laminating pressure-sensitive adhesive (PSA layer) to cover the first surface of the base material; drying the PSA layer to provide a dry layer; applying a second layer of a melted hot melt adhesive (detackified layer, or DL) on top of the first layer; cooling the second layer to form a solidified layer of hot melt adhesive; forming the tape into a tape width by cutting; and winding the tape into a roll (col. 7, lines 50-57; col. 8, lines 49-51; col. 10, lines 5-7; col. 11, lines 43-62). Miekka et al. also teaches "it may be desirable to tint the DL to avoid having to use a tinted second substrate, or to avoid having to tint the PSA layer as the use of tint in the PSA layer may adversely affect its adhesive properties" (col. 32, lines 34-37). The Examiner notes that while Miekka et al. teaches away from the use of tint, or coloring agent, in the first PSA layer, the reference none-the-less teaches that it is known to use coloring agent in the PSA layer. Alternatively, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 1762

for one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided coloring agent in the PSA layer upon seeing the teachings of Miekka et al. with the expected loss of adhesive properties of the PSA layer.

Miekka et al. teaches that the substrate may be in the form of any material suitable to act as a carrier for the construction, and preferred substrates include flexible materials that are sheet stock or roll or web stock (col. 7, lines 28-32). Miekka et al. lacks a specific teaching of applying its adhesive to a polymeric film. Xie et al. is cited for its similar teachings of a facestock material provided with two adhesive layers thereon to form a multilayer PSA construction. Xie et al. provides a list of exemplary facestock materials that are suitable flexible materials to form a construction with adhesives applied thereon, including a number of polymeric materials (col. 13, lines 20-43). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art, having seen the references of Miekka et al. and Xie et al. in combination, to have used a polymeric material as the base substrate in the method of Miekka et al. with the expectation of successful results since Miekka et al. generally discloses use of conventional flexible materials and is not limiting.

As to the new limitation requiring "using a mixer to mix a laminating adhesive with a colouring agent to form a mixture; and transferring the mixture directly from the mixer to a roller and simultaneously suing the roller to apply the mixture to the first surface of the base film so as to form a first layer covering the first surface of the base film", the Examiner notes that Miekka et al. teaches that its laminating adhesive layer may be applied by a roller coating in col. 9, lines 35-37. While Miekka et al. lacks a teaching of mixing the coloring agent with its PSA material in a mixer, it would have

Art Unit: 1762

been well within the skill of an ordinary artisan to have used a mixer to mix the coloring agent and PSA material prior to application in order to ensure that the PSA layer that is applied is homogeneously colored. Further, Miekka et al. lacks a specific teaching of transferring the mixture directly from the mixer to a roller and simultaneously using the roller to apply the mixture. However, the Examiner notes that it is well known in the art to simultaneously transfer a coating material directly from a mixer to the application device (such as a roller applicator) in a web coating process in order for the process to run continuously on the indefinite web substrate, thus running efficiently and effectively and not being periodically stopped as in batch operations. Alternatively, Piacente et al. is cited for its teaching of mixing colored decorative particles 13 and a resin 14 in a mixer 15, and then transferring the mixture to a roller applicator while simultaneously coating a web substrate (see Figure 1). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have simultaneously transferred a colored PSA mixture from a mixer to a roller applicator in the process of Miekka et al., particularly upon seeing the prior art of Piacente et al., with the expectation of improved efficiency and maintaining a continuous web coating process.

With respect to claim 2, Miekka et al. teaches that the laminate construction may be split lengthwise to form two or more different rolls (col. 8, lines 49-54). It would have been obvious to have wound the tapes into individual supply packages in order to sell them commercially.

As to claim 3, Xie et al. teaches that the polymeric base film may be polyethylene terephthalate in col. 15, lines 41-47.

Art Unit: 1762

As to claims 4-5 and 7, Miekka et al. teaches that its construction is then laminated to a second substrate which may be paper (col. 20, lines 21-26 and col. 21). It is the Examiner's position that the shape and end use of Miekka et al.'s construction is a matter of design choice that would be determined by one having ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 6, Miekka et al. is silent with regard to the thickness of the base film. It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum base film thickness through routine experimentation depending upon the desired end use of the product, in the absence of a showing of criticality.

As to claim 8, Miekka et al. teaches that the first adhesive (PSA) layer may be applied as a liquid including solvent (col. 11, lines 53-62).

As to claim 10, Miekka et al. teaches bonding the hot melt adhesive to a second substrate by heating the adhesive in col. 21, lines 10-18.

As to claim 11, Miekka et al. teaches that the base film preferably has a release material thereon (col. 7, lines 33-35), and the hot melt (DL) adhesive layer may be pressure-sensitive (col. 8, lines 55-58).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that neither Miekka nor Xie discloses forming a colored tape that includes a base film, a first layer and a second layer, wherein the first layer is formed as recited by Applicant, namely by using a mixer and simultaneously transferring the mixture directly from the mixer to a roller and using the roller to apply the mixture to the first surface of the base film. The Examiner notes that Miekka et al.

Art Unit: 1762

teaches applying its PSA layer by a roller applicator in col. 9, lines 35-37. It is the Examiner's position that it would have been within the skill of an ordinary artisan to first perform mixing in a mixer, and also to simultaneously transfer the mixture from the mixer to the roller applicator and apply the PSA mixture with the roller applicator in a continuous web coating process for reasons of efficiency and economy, as discussed in more detail above.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 1762

Oita et al. (US 5,683,805) is cited for its teaching of using a roller to apply a colored adhesive composition.

Ugolick et al. (US 5,993,961) and Scholz et al. (US 6,083,338) are cited to demonstrate methods of forming constructions comprising a base film and two adhesive layers applied thereon.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kirsten C. Jolley whose telephone number is 571-272-1421. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762